



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,128	11/20/2003	Yuen Khim Liow	006404.P012	2239

7590 07/29/2004
Stephen M. De Klerk
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

GUSHI, ROSS N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2833

DATE MAILED: 07/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/719,128

Applicant(s)

LIOW ET AL.

Examiner

Ross N. Gushi

Art Unit

2833

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 7, 15-19, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 5, 6, 8-14, 20, 21 and 24-30 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 20 November 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 15-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. ("Robinson") in view of Liao and Lin.

Regarding claims 1, 2, Robinson discloses a connection apparatus 54 for a portable device 40, the connection apparatus including a connector and a connector cable, the connector cable having an inner end for permanent connection to internal circuitry of the portable device, and an outer end connected to the connector.

Robinson does not state specifically that the connector and the connector cable are capable of (a) data transfer both ways between the portable device and another device, and power one way to the portable device from the another device, when the another device is a host for the portable device; and (b) data transfer both ways between the portable device and the another device, and power transfer both ways between the portable device and the another device, when the portable device is the host for the another device. Lin discloses a USB or IEEE 1394 connector which is capable of (a) data transfer both ways between the portable device and another device, and power one way to the portable device from the another device, when the another device is a host for the portable device; and (b) data transfer both ways between the

portable device and the another device, and power transfer both ways between the portable device and the another device, when the portable device is the host for the another device. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use a USB or IEEE 1394 connector on the Robinson device. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to facilitate communications using standard and well known connectors which are widely available and used, such motivation being well known in the art.

Robinson does not show a recess in the wall. Liao discloses a housing including a recess for holding the plug 40 and cable 4 (see figure 1). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify the Robinson housing to include a recess to hold the connector and cable, as taught in Liao and Lin (see e.g. Lin col. 1). The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to store the cable and connector more securely and prevent damage to the cable and connector, as taught in Liao and Lin and as is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 3, locating the recess (as taught in Liao) in Robinson where the cable exits the Robinson housing would result in the recess being sized, shaped and located to not interfere with any operation of a plurality of keys of the portable device.

Per claim 4, the Liao the recess has two parallel opposed side walls, and a rear wall extending between and joining the opposed side walls; a lower wall and a top wall both extending between and joining the two opposed side walls and the rear wall, the lower wall being spaced from and parallel to the top wall; there being a gap in the rear wall for passage therethrough of the connector cable, the connector cable

extending between the gap and the connector with a curved shape when the connector is in the recess.

Per claim 15, Liao discloses that when the connector is in the recess, the first side surface of the connector is substantially coplanar with the wall.

Claims 16, 17, 18, and 19 are rejected for the reasons pertaining to claims 1-4 and 15.

Claims 7, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robinson et al. ("Robinson") in view of Liao and Lin as in claims 1 and 16 in view of Tseng et al. ("Tseng"). Liao does not show projections to hold the connector. Tseng discloses recesses 712 and detents 724 to hold a plug in a recess. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to use well know retention mechanisms, such as small projection as taught in Tseng, to hold the plug in the recess. The suggestion or motivation for doing so would have been to secure the plug to the recess, as taught in Tseng. The choice of having the detents on the recess wall or the plug would have been a matter of obvious engineering choice without patentable significance.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5, 6, 8-14, 20, 21, and 24-30 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Regarding claims 5 and 20, the prior art does not suggest the as apparatus claimed, including the combination of all the claimed elements, the combination including that the connector cable passes through the gap at an angle to the rear wall so as to bias the connector cable to the


Art Unit: 2833

curved shape, the angle being in the range 30 to 60 degrees. Regarding claim 6, the prior art does not suggest the as apparatus claimed, including the combination of all the claimed elements, the combination including a projection extending from a first wall of the two parallel, opposed side walls towards the second wall of the two parallel, opposed side walls; the projection having an inner end spaced from the second wall by a distance substantially the same as a length of the connector, the projection also having an inner curved surface to facilitate the connector cable forming a curved shape when in the recess.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ross Gushi whose telephone number is (571) 272-2005. If attempts to reach the examiner by phone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paula A. Bradley, can be reached at 571-272-2800 extension 33. The phone number for the Group's facsimile is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


ROSS GUSHI
PRIMARY EXAMINER